

## REMARKS

### **Request for Reconsideration, Claims Pending**

The non-final Official action mailed on 26 January 2007 has been considered carefully. Reconsideration of the claimed invention in view of the amendments above and the discussion below is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 14, 16, 20, 24, 28-30, 32 and 34 were indicated as being allowable although they stand objected to for dependence on rejected base or intervening claims.

Claims 1-4, 8-9, 11-15, 20-21, 26-27 and 28-33 are pending.

### **Patentability of Claims Over Jones**

#### **Rejection Summary**

Claims 1-3, 9, 12, 13, 15, 19, 21-23, 25-27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for anticipation by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0052849 (Jones).

#### **Claim 1 & Related Claims**

Claim 1 was amended to include limitations of allowable Claim 7 and intervening Claim 6. The preamble of Claim 1 was also amended to eliminate the communications network field of use. Jones fails to disclose or suggest a method for validating a non-network based location fix of a mobile station comprising

... evaluating the validity of the non-network based location fix of the mobile station by determining whether the non-network based location fix is within a specified range of a prior location fix,

the specified range based on an estimated velocity of the mobile station and a time interval between the generation of the prior location fix and the non-network based location fix.

In paragraph [0022], Jones discloses comparing an initial location and GPS time to validation data sets received over the air from a server. Jones does not specify what constitutes the validation data sets. Amended Claim 1 is thus patentably distinguished over Jones.

Claims 3, 4, 8 and 11, dependent from Claim 1, have been amended for consistency with Amended Claim 1.

### Discussion of Claim 12

Independent Claim 12 was amended to include limitations of allowable Claim 16. The preamble of Claim 12 was also amended to eliminate the cellular communications network field of use. Jones fails to disclose or suggest a method for validating a satellite positioning system based location fix of a satellite positioning system enabled cellular mobile station comprising

... ordering a plurality of prior location fixes by applying a corresponding time of acquisition attribute thereto;

evaluating the validity of the satellite positioning system based location fix by comparing the satellite positioning system based location fix to at least one of the plurality of time stamped prior location fixes.

In paragraph [0022], Jones discloses comparing an initial location and GPS time to validation data sets received over the air from a server. Jones does not specify what constitutes the validation data sets. Jones nevertheless fails to disclose "ordering" location fixes. Amended Claim 12 is thus patentably distinguished over Jones. Claims 13-15 have been amended for consistency with amended Claim 12.

### Discussion of Claim 21

Independent Claim 21 was amended to include limitations of Claim 25. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Jones fails to disclose or suggest a method for validating a location fix of a mobile station comprising

- ... estimating a future position fix of the mobile station based on the plurality of location fixes;
- evaluating the validity of a recently generated location fix of the mobile station by determining whether it is within a specified range of the estimated future position fix of the mobile station.

In paragraph [0022], Jones discloses comparing an initial location and GPS time to validation data sets received over the air from a server. Jones does not specify what constitutes the validation data sets. Jones nevertheless fails to disclose "estimating a future position fix" and "evaluating the validity of a recently generated location fix ... by determining whether it is within a specified range of the estimated future position fix ...." Amended Claim 21 is thus patentably distinguished over Jones. Claims 26 was been amended to depend directly from amended Claim 21.

Discussion of Claim 27

Independent Claim 27 was amended to include limitations of allowable Claim 28. Jones fails to disclose or suggest a cellular mobile station comprising

... an information processor ... for evaluating the validity of a satellite positioning system based location fix based on at least one prior mobile station location fix stored in memory.

In paragraph [0022], Jones discloses comparing an initial location and GPS time to validation data sets received over the air from a server. Jones does not specify what constitutes the validation data sets. Amended Claim 27 is thus patentable over Jones. Claim 29 was amended for consistency with Claim 27.

**Prayer For Relief**

In view of any amendments and the discussion above, the Claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly withdraw any rejections and objections and allow this application to issue as a United States Patent without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

/ ROLAND K. BOWLER II /

---

ROLAND K. BOWLER II      30 MAR. 2007  
REG. NO. 33,477

MOTOROLA, INC.  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (RKB)  
600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, W4-37Q  
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

TELEPHONE NO. (847) 523-3978  
FACSIMILE NO. (847) 523-2350